DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 059 CS 503 154

AUTHOR Adams, R. C.; Copeland, Gary A.
TITLE An Investigation of Mediated Person Peception Comparing Jungian Archetypes to Perception of Nonverbal Cues.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Cultural Images; *Cultural Influences; Higher Education; *Nonverbal Communication; *Perception; Pictorial Stimuli
IDENTIFIERS *Archetypes

ABSTRACT

The effects of photographic framing on viewer perceptions of men and women was studied across five cultural groups, enabling the comparison of Jung's theory of universal archetypes to a contemporary theory of culture-bound, learned nonverbal cues. Subjects for the study were 140 college students from five cultural groups: Anglo, Chicano, Iranian, Japanese, and Taiwanese. The photographic stimuli consisted of the same 24 pictures of four different Anglo people--two male and two female. The subjects were given the pictures and told to select the person he or she would most likely hire or promote solely on the basis of first impressions. Additional sorting procedures were used to refine the findings. The results supported Jung's concept of the archetype over theories of cultural uniqueness in perceptions of men and women. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original documen *
****

ED196059

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN INVESTIGATION OF MEDIATED PERSON PERCEPTION COMPARING JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES TO PERCEPTION OF NONVERBAL CUES

by

R. C. Adams
Communication Arts and Sciences Department
California State University, Fresno

and

Gary A. Copeland
Speech Communication Department
The Pennsylvania State University

Presented to
Speech Communication Association
New York

November 14, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.C. Adams
Gary A. Copeland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503154

AN INVESTIGATION OF MEDIATED PERSON PERCEPTION COMPARING JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES TO PERCEPTION OF NONVERBAL CUES*

People's perceptions of each other have become objects of scientific inquiry in the fields of psychology and communication. Most research, however, has been conducted through some medium of display such as photographs rather than in a face-to-face interpersonal context such as that in which day-to-day person perceptions are made and judgements formed. This paper reports a study of evaluative responses to pictures of people in the context of their sex and pictorial framing by respondents from five different cultural groups. The study was undertaken to compare Jung's theory of universal archetypes to contemporary theory of culture-bound, learned nonverbal cues.

Background

The effect of photographic framing on viewer perceptions of men and women has recently begun to be examined. McCain and Divers studied the relation among body types--ectomorph, endomorph, and mesomorph; shot length--close-up, medium, and long; and sex, in a television setting. They observed a significant interaction between shot length and sex; men were perceived to be more dynamic--a dimension of credibility--in close-up and medium shots, women to be more dynamic in long shots. Similarly, men received higher social attraction ratings in close-up and medium shots, women in long shots.[1]

Archer, Kimes, and Barrios suggest a uniform principle may underly perceptions of men and women. Their work involved analysis of photographic framings of people in five selected publications plus Draw-a-Person type protocols from 40 male and 40 female university students. Their general conclusion is that people tend to look at men's faces and women's bodies as part of the recognition process.[2]

Adams, Copeland, Fish, and Hughes tested the differential effects of framing on perceptions of men and women as photographic subjects. They operationalized the independent variable by creating a "deck" of 24 pictures consisting of six photographic framings--close-up, head-and-shoulders, bust, waist, three-quarters, and full-length--of four different subjects, two men and two women. Respondents ranked the four "political candidates" and then ranked the six framings of the preferred male and female. Clear and significant differences emerged in framing preferences for presentation of men in close-up, waist, and full-length shots and of women in bust, waist, and three-quarter shots.[3]

The findings of McCain and Divers, Archer et al., and Adams et al. are open to explanation by two very different theoretical perspectives. The first suggests a universal patterning of recognition for the two sexes. The second suggests a more culture-bound, learned search for nonverbal cues.

First, the contemporary findings cited above support prior observations by psychologists, archeologists, and others who have studied paleolithic art forms and early myths. Neumann has noted that early stone carvings and other art forms representing goddesses

detail "breasts and belly" and, sometimes, the genital areas--frequently to the point of exaggerating size, protuberance, and/or rotundity. While body details are usually indicated, the head frequently remains faceless.[4] Marshack's examination of artifacts of early man affirms Neumann's observations. Marshack considers these images manifestations of a "time factoring" process based upon the observable reproductive cycles of women.[5]

The woman's role in the reproductive process has set her apart from men in human society.[6] This reproductive role could logically have led to the placement of woman at the center of creation myths and stories. Harding reports "god-mother" myths to be pervasive across Europe, Asia, and Africa.[7]

Jung and his disciples have proposed the central symbol for the feminine is the vessel[8]: ". . . woman is experienced as the vessel par excellence. . . . the identity of the female personality with the encompassing body-vessel in which the child is sheltered belongs to the foundation of feminine existence, woman is . . . the 'life vessel as such' . . . ."[9] Seeing woman as the vessel of life would be a universal phenomenon cutting across cultural boundaries.

The alternative theory derives from an attempt to gather nonverbal data differentially for male and female pictorial subjects. Ekman has noted two broad classes of nonverbal cue sources--the head and the body.[10] Evidence indicates that nonverbal cues from women's heads may not be considered a reliable communication source. Studies by Bugental and her associates indicate children from five to eight years of age tend to believe men's smiles to be a sign of friend-

liness or happiness, but not necessarily so with women's smiles.[11] Also, they indicate that children from five to twelve years of age, when confronted by contradictory verbal and nonverbal messages from a woman, tend to believe the verbal.[12] Further, they report men are more likely to smile at appropriate times when interacting with children than are middle-class women, who smile even when disciplining. Lower socioeconomic class women also smile more at inappropriate times than do men, but much less than their middle-class counterparts.[13] This observed tendency to smile, among women, extends beyond their interaction with children; Rosenfeld has reported women in interaction with adult men tend to smile and give positive head nods even when attempting to avoid giving approval.[14] The smile of a woman has been seen as a gesture of subservience equatable with the "shuffle."[15]

This evidence suggests children may learn at an early age that nonverbal cues from a woman's face are not reliable indicators of her internal state. This "knowledge" may well be retained into adulthood to become a part of an individual's recognition and person-perception processes. People would, thus, learn to seek out additional nonverbal cues from both head and body with women while still accepting and responding to nonverbal cues from the head with men. If this theoretical conception is valid, such cultural and subcultural variety, as noted above, can be expected as a consequence of the variety inherent in learned behavior.

Which of these two theories best explains the observed phenomena? The research question is, Will different cultures hold different patterns in their behavioral responses to "picturing" men and women,

or will a universal pattern be found to prevail? If the framing preferences are derived from Jung's archetypes—"fundamental patterns of symbolic formation which are observed to recur throughout mankind in the contents of the mythologies of all people"[16]—or any sort of universal symbol, then the pattern of response noted before should emerge in all cultures. If the behavior is learned, then patterns of response should appear that differ among cultures. The concept of an archetype, or any such universal symbol, may be of little theoretical value if patterning varies significantly from culture to culture; alternatively, the concept of culturally socialized perception patterns may be shown to have a broader generalizability if patterning of responses is not observed to vary significantly from culture to culture. The first hypothesis tests for universality.

H_1 Preferential rankings of selected framings of people within any one culture will not differ significantly from the rankings of selected framings of people in any other culture.

Then, if the Jungian notion of Woman = Vessel is operative as an archetype, a universal preference for body--i. e., bust, waist, and three-quarter--shots should be observed across all cultures.

H_2 The preferred framings of women photographic subjects will be bust, waist, and three-quarter shots over all cultures.

Finally, since no difference has been shown in the way in which men and women respond to the sexes by either Archer et al. or Adams et al., the last two hypotheses proffered are:

H_3 Male and female respondents will not differ in their preferential rankings of framings for men or for women across cultures.

H_4 Male and female respondents will not differ in their preferential rankings of framings for men or for women within any culture.

Methodology

During the Spring of 1979, the study was fielded with respondents selected from the student body of a state university in the West. Five cultural groups--Anglo, Chicano, Iranian, Japanese, and Taiwanese--were included. Anglo and Chicano respondents were randomly selected from beginning Speech Communication classes; they were interviewed by an Anglo female in an office setting. Respondents for the other three cultural groups were solicited through the interviewers' own personal networks. Each group was interviewed by a fellow international student from the same homeland and culture, permitting interviews to be conducted in the native language of the interviewer/respondent. The Iranian and Taiwanese interviewers were female; the Japanese, male. All four interviewers were graduate students in Mass Communications, trained for the task.[17] International student interviews took place in a variety of locations--in their homes, in the library, and at the campus coffee shop. Table 1 displays the sex and culture breakout of the total sample.

* * * * *

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

* * * * *

The photographic stimuli consisted of the same 24 unretouched, 5-by-7 inch color proofs of four different people used in the Adams et al. study. Two men and two women, Anglo acquaintances, had posed in a variety of activities in the local county law library, on adjacent streets, and in the executive offices of a metropolitan bank branch. They had been instructed to dress as though for setting up the photography for a political campaign--for that study; the same pictures are well suited to representation of the subjects as prospective employees or candidates for promotion--for the present study.

Administration of the interview schedule called for respondents to receive the full deck of 24 photographs with instructions to sort through them and to select the person the respondent would most likely hire or promote solely on the basis of "first impressions." Once such an identification was made, the six framings of that subject were removed and the deck returned to the respondents for a second choice selection; when that was made, a discrimination between the remaining pair was obtained.

The six photographs of the subject chosen first by the respondent were then returned with the request for the respondent to select the one picture that would best represent the personality of the photographic subject, the picture that ought to go forward with a hiring or promotion recommendation. When a first choice had been made, a second was requested, and so on, until all six framings of the person had been ranked. Then the preferred subject of the opposite sex was presented in the same fashion.

Age was gathered from all respondents and sex was noted. For international students, length of sojourn in the United States was

also obtained in the event some potential for post hoc consideration of this variable might arise; none did.

Because the focus of the investigation was on the ways in which individuals rank pictures of people, by framing, the data are ordinal. Manipulations of ordinal-level data bespeak use of nonparametric statistics appropriate to ranks. The known arsenal of nonparametric statistics does not offer a multi-dimensional approach to ranked data; the goodness-of-fit statistic, G, was adopted for statistical tests of the hypotheses with the 5% level of confidence accepted as the criterion.[18] Data were processed by computer to obtain contingency tables, the G statistic was estimated by manual procedures.

Results

To evaluate the first hypothesis, the frequency data were cast into a three-way Cultures x Framings x Rankings table for the combined male and female responses to the pictorial framings of men and women together. Evaluation of the hypothesis via this blind clumping of the data provides the most comprehensive, but the least specific, test for cultural and sex patterns. The estimated $G = 347.388$ ($df = 165$) is significant at well beyond $p = .001$. This comprehensive test of the hypothesis by application of the G statistic clearly indicates a significant effect. Partitioning for two-way relationships reveals only the Framings x Rankings dependency to be significant ($G = 184.806$, $df = 25$, $p < .001$); or, ranking responses are significantly dependent upon the photographic framing in which the subject is presented across all five cultures. Testing further, the three-way interaction effect was assessed and found to be significant ($G = 162.583$, $df = 100$,

$p < .001$); or, "the degree of association . . . between one pair of factors differs over the several levels or classes of a third factor."[19] Therefore, the significant Framings x Rankings dependency varies in degree over these five cultures.

To evaluate the second hypothesis, the frequency data were cast into a series of contingency tables juxtaposing framing against framing, over all cultures, for those paired combinations addressed by the hypothesis. Nine such pairings were made and the G statistic applied to each. The comparisons are presented in Table 2; judged against the criterion level ($G = 37.653$, $df = 25$, $p = .05$), all pairings are significantly lacking in independence. A visual scan of the patterns in the nine contingency tables used shows that in all cases the data conform to the hypothesis; bust, waist, and three-quarter shots of women are selected over close-up, head-and-shoulder, and full-length shots.

* * * * *

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

* * * * *

To evaluate the third hypothesis, the frequency data were cast into four three-dimensional tables--Cultures x Framings x Rankings--using male responses to women and to men, and female responses to women and to men, respectively. The first test in each of the four cases was for significance of three-way effect. In all four assessments, the value of G exceeded the criterion level. Significant interdependence among Cultures, Framings, and Ranking responses is noted

under all four conditions. The second test was for two-way interdependencies within the tables. In three of the four conditions, the Framings x Rankings comparison was noted to produce a significant G statistic; the exception was for female responses to women (where $.10 > p > .05$). Ranking responses are noted to be significantly dependent upon Framing for male responses to men and to women and for female responses to men but not to women. The third test was for three-way interaction; significant G statistics were produced in all four conditions; the influence of Framings on Rankings varies in degree over these five Cultures.

The final hypothesis was not tested statistically due to the small ns. A visual inspection of the clusters revealed comparatively few discrepancies in the male and female responses to either men or women--evaluated in terms of frequencies of Rankings for Framings within each of the Cultures. Only one of these is great enough to merit comment, given the small numbers; that is the Taiwanese male rejection of the head-and-shoulder shot for photographs of men--12 of 15 rankings were 4, 5, and 6--versus the Taiwanese female acceptance--8 of 15 rankings were 1 and 2. The general observation, however, is that no differences between male and female responses to men and women, within these cultures, is sufficiently striking to suggest a consistent pattern of response based in perception patterns having been differentially developed by sex within any of these five cultures.

Discussion

The first hypothesis constituted a test for universality of framing preference across cultures. Application of the G statistic provides opportunity for assessing a "main effect" for Framings x Rankings and for Cultures x Rankings. The observed Framings x Rankings interdependency is interpreted as supportive, in general, of the archetype concept in that Rankings would seem to be significantly dependent on the Framing presented. Given the absence of a significant Cultures x Rankings interdependency, the test of the first hypothesis is interpreted as supporting Jung's concept of the archetype--or something like it--over a theory of cultural uniqueness in perceptions of men and women. Identification of a significant three-way interaction effect, given no significant interdependency for Cultures x Rankings and a significant interdependency for Framings x Rankings, leads to the conclusion that some cultural patterning is indeed overlaid on the basic, common perception of distinctions between men and women.

In the context of the test of the first hypothesis, the second seems clearly to support Neumann's conception of the woman's identity being vested in the body. Bust, waist, and three-quarter shots present the body "up close." Close-up, head-and-shoulder, and full-length shots do not present the body or present it only at a distance. The significant trend in each comparison to reject the close-up, head-and-shoulder, and full-length shots in favor of the bust, waist, and three-quarter shots of women is seen as evidence of a body identification in male and female responses to women. However, these data do not provide support for Neumann's conception of the woman's body as

the life vessel or the vessel par excellence in human terms--i. e., as empirical observations of contemporary behavior rather than as ex post facto abstractions from past products of the human mind. Nor do these data provide support for the head versus body non-verbal cues conception of some person perception theorists in that still photographs were used--presenting no movement cues, only a posture and/or an expression "frozen" by the camera. Still, one essential element of each theoretical perspective seems to be merged in these findings: As Jungian psychology predicts, the focus on the woman is body-oriented; yet, as person perception theorists would predict, body cues might be sought to support the truth of personal expression--perhaps to confirm expression of female sexual identity.

The test of the third hypothesis was virtually unnecessary in light of the outcomes of the first two; it was carried out to assess potential cancelling of effects that might have been concealed by the indiscriminate grouping of data across respondent and/or subject sex. None were found; only the female response to women was not significant at the criterion level, but the pattern corresponded to those of the other comparisons. In effect, no evidence can be offered at this point to suggest that males and females perceive the sexes differently across these cultures. Similarly, the data patterns generated in evaluating the fourth hypothesis provide no evidence of sex-specific responses by males and females to men or to women within any of these cultures. Both of these findings are seen as support for the universality--crossing both sex and culture--of an archetypal differentiation between the sexes. Clearly, culture plays only a secondary role in

these differential responses to men and to women--a kind of cultural overlay on the basic pattern Jungian psychology ascribes to all of humanity.

McCain and Divers noted that interaction between framing and sex of photographic subjects makes a difference in audience responses to men and women in a television setting. Archer et al. observed the prevailing use of photographs in newspapers and magazines to employ closer framings of men than of women as well as the apparently natural tendency of college-age adults to represent men and women in similarly different fashions in freehand drawings. Adams et al. identified a general preference for body-inclusive shots of women over closer framings and over the presentation of the full-length shot. These observations seemed to corroborate the thinking of Jung and his followers but remained open to alternative explanations. Present findings demonstrate the patterns to prevail across both sexes and over five cultural groups, as would be predicted by Jungian psychology. The most basic perceptual distinction between the sexes may, then, be deeply rooted in all humanity; cultural learning about sex differentiation may be little more than a thin, albeit durable, veneer overlaid on a basic human response.

These findings, taken in context, suggest that person perception research using mediated stimuli take into account an additional dimension, framing. Likewise, media practitioners/users will benefit from an awareness of varying audience perceptions of the visible communicator or subject of communication by framing. The McCain and Divers study cited above needs to be replicated with greater variety

of framing, with other media, and with the visible subject filling different communication roles. The potential for a Sex x Medium interaction--as suggested by McLuhan[20] and partly explored by Fish[21]--merits considerably more attention. Also, some potential seems to exist for a Sex x Medium x Framing interaction. In short, audience perceptions of a communicator or communication subject in the media may be more basic than has been realized and more readily manipulated--consciously or not--than has been apparent.

In conclusion, despite such limitations as studying only five cultural groups, obtaining judgements cross-culturally rather than intraculturally, and presenting only two male and two female stimuli in the research context, some fairly clear evidence is presented that the Jungian archetype may indeed prevail--at least in perceptions of women. Cultural patterns, to the extent they may exist, in the area of person perception seem to be, at best, secondary to the basic pattern identified with the archetype. The basic pattern seems to be common to both men and women--at least in regard to perceptions of women being based in a body perspective, relying on body-inclusive framings. The archetype, or some universal symbol, is favored over a learned response in that evidences of cultural variety are secondary and point towards variation on a theme rather than variation qua variation by culture.

FOOTNOTES

*We wish to thank dear friends and valued colleagues who have contributed to the quality and validity of our efforts by being responsive to our early conceptualizations and/or reviewing and critiqueing earlier drafts of this report. With no intent to minimize our personal culpability for whatever flaws you may detect in our work, we publicly acknowledge the support of four: Dr. Rita A. Atwood, Assistant Professor of Radio-Television-Film, University of Texas, Austin; Ms. Marjorie Fish, doctoral student in Radio-Television-Film, University of Texas, Austin; Dr. Richard B. Gregg, Professor of Speech Communication, The Pennsylvania State University; and Ms. Gail Wasser, Coordinator of the Women's Studies Program, California State University, Fresno.

[1]Thomas A. McCain and Lawrence Divers, with others, "The Effects of Body Type and Camera Shots on Interpersonal Attraction and Source Credibility," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, New York, 1973, p. 9.

[2]Dane Archer, Debra D. Kimes, and Michael Barrios, "Face-ism," Psychology Today, 12 (September 1978), 65-66.

[3]R. C. Adams, Gary A. Copeland, Marjorie J. Fish, and Melissa Hughes, "The Effect of Framing on Selection of Photographs of Men and Women," Journalism Quarterly, 57 (Autumn 1980), 463-467.

[4]Erich Neumann, The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype, tr. by Ralph Mannheim, Bollingen Series XLVII (New York: Pantheon Books, 1965), pp. 95-96.

[5]Alexander Marshack, Roots of Civilization: The Cognitive Beginnings of Man's First Art, Symbol, and Notation (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 281-340.

[6]Anne Steinmann and David J. Fox, The Male Dilemma (New York: Jason Aronson, 1974), p. 27.

[7]M. Esther Harding, Women's Mysteries Ancient and Modern: A Psychological Interpretation of the Feminine Principle as Portrayed in Myth, Story, and Dreams, rev. ed. (New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1971), pp. 95-116.

[8]Neumann, p. 39.

[9]Neumann, p. 42.

[10]Paul Ekman, "Differential Communication of Affect by Head and Body Cues," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2 (1965), 735.

[11]Daphne Bugental, J. W. Kaswan, L. R. Love, and M. N. Fox, "Child versus Adult Perception of Evaluation Messages in Verbal, Vocal, and Visual Channels," Developmental Psychology, 2 (1970), 367-375.

[12]Daphne Bugental, J. W. Kaswan, and L. R. Love, "Perceptions of Contradictory Meanings Conveyed by Verbal and Nonverbal Channels," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16 (1970), 647-655.

[13]Daphne Bugental, L. R. Love, and R. M. Gianetto, "Perfidious Feminine Faces," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17 (1971), 314-318.

[14]Howard M. Rosenfeld, "Approval-seeking and Approval-inducing Functions of Verbal and Nonverbal Responses in the Dyad," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4 (1966), 604.

[15]Shulamith Firestone, The Dialectic of Sex (New York: William Morrow, 1970), p. 90.

[16]Ira Progoff, Jung's Psychology and Its Social Meaning (Garden City, N. Y.: Arno Press, 1973), p. 58; also see C. G. Jung, Psychology and Religion: Terry Lectures, 1937 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), p. 63.

[17]We express appreciation to Melissa Hughes, Zohreh Eghtesady, Shigeru (Sam) Takakura, and Hsia Cheng Hsing (Janice) for their assistance in data collection.

[18]Robert R. Sokal and F. James Rohlf, Biometry: The Principle and Practices of Statistics in Biological Research (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1969), pp. 575-607.

[19]Sokal and Rohlf, p. 607.

[20]Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), pp. 317-319.

[20]Marjorie J. Fish, "Analysis of Response Differences to Identical Visual Content Viewed on Film or Video," unpublished M. A. thesis,

California State University, Fresno, 1980.

TABLE 1

Description of Respondents Sample by Sex and Culture

Sex	Anglo	Chicano	Iranian	Japanese	Taiwanese	Totals
M	12	15	15	15	15	72
F	16	10	12	15	15	68
Totals	28	25	27	30	30	140

TABLE 2

Framings Comparisons for Testing H_2 with Associated G Values

Framings	G
Bust x Close-up	68.286
Bust x Head-and-Shoulders	41.947
Bust x Full-length	60.249
Waist x Close-up	87.939
Waist x Head-and-shoulders	72.158
Waist x Full-length	70.409
Three-quarter x Close-up	63.068
Three-quarter x Head-and-Shoulders	51.559
Three-quarters x Full-length	72.449